

32w

32692

Customer Number

Patent
Case No.: 57474US013



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: DESARD, CHRISTOPHE
Application No.: 10/634300 Group Art Unit: 2831
Filed: August 5, 2003 Examiner: Harris, Anton B.
Title: SEALED AND ADAPTABLE CABLE BUSHING WITH EASY CABLE
POSITIONING AND SLEEVE EQUIPPED WITH SUCH A BUSHING

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:	
Sept. 1, 2004	
Date	Signed by: James J. Trussell

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2004. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 were restricted under 35 USC § 121 as follows:

- I. Claims 1-22 are said to be drawn to the structure of a cable bushing, classified in class 174, subclass 11BH;
- II. Claims 23-26 are said to be drawn to a method for manufacturing a cable bushing, classified in class 29, subclass 887;

Election

In response, Applicants elect Group I, claims 1-22, with traverse.

Reconsideration and withdrawal or modification of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

In Group I, claims 1-22, Applicants broadly claim a cable bushing. In Group II, claims 23-26, Applicants broadly claim a method of forming a cable bushing.

The Restriction Requirement in Paragraph 1 states: "the process as claimed in Group II can be used to make other and materially different product than that claimed in Group I, such as a grommet."

Applicants submit that the Groups I and II claims are so interrelated that a search of one group of claims will reveal art to the other. Moreover, the classification of Groups I and II claims in different classes and subclasses is not sufficient grounds to require restriction.

Were restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I and II, a separate examination of the claims in Groups I and II would require substantial duplication of work on the part of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Even though some additional consideration would be necessary, the scope of analysis of novelty of all the claims of Groups I and II would have to be as rigorous as when only the claims of Group I were being considered by themselves. Clearly, this duplication of effort would not be warranted where these claims of different categories are so interrelated. Further, Applicants submit that for restriction to be effected between the claims in Groups I and II, it would place an undue burden by requiring payment of a separate filing fee for examination of the nonelected claims, as well as the added costs associated with prosecuting two applications and maintaining two patents.

Conclusion

Applicants have elected Group I, claims 1-22. Continued prosecution of this application is respectfully requested.


It is believed that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, please charge the fee to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number with questions that can be resolved with a simple teleconference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

Sept 1, 2004

By:



James J. Trussell, Reg. No.: 37,251
Telephone No.: (512) 984-4672

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833